

From: Parker, Frank L [frank.l.parker@Vanderbilt.Edu]
Sent: Monday, February 07, 2011 2:02 PM
To: john.kotek@blueribboncommission.net
Cc: Parker, Frank L
Subject: Additional topics for the BRC to consider

Dear John,

Sorry that it has taken so long to get back to you with this. I kept improving it but there comes a time when the gain is not worth the time expended. You can certainly distribute it as widely as you like.

I have just read Bob Budnitz's and Tom Cotton's report. Both are good friends of mine. You might find it useful to have a panel discussion on Bob's report as there are, as he indicated, different views on a number of his comments, some of which I addressed in my presentation and in answer to some questions asked then. by members of the Sub-committee.

Best personal wishes,

Frank

From: Parker, Frank L
Sent: Monday, January 17, 2011 12:05 PM
To: john.kotek@blueribboncommission.net
Subject: RE: Additional topics for the BRC to consider

From: john.kotek@blueribboncommission.net [john.kotek@blueribboncommission.net]
Sent: Tuesday, December 28, 2010 3:56 PM
To: Parker, Frank L
Subject: RE: Additional topics for the BRC to consider

Thanks Frank. I'll give this a close read and look forward to seeing the completed version. Do you mind if I share this among the staff or would you prefer that I wait until it is complete?

Have a great trip and a Happy New Year!

John Kotek
Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future
202-460-2308
john.kotek@blueribboncommission.net

From: Parker, Frank L [frank.l.parker@Vanderbilt.Edu]
Sent: Monday, December 27, 2010 6:43 PM
To: john.kotek@blueribboncommission.net
Cc: Parker, Frank L
Subject: Additional topics for the BRC to consider

Dear John,

I have tried to keep current with the presentations to the BRC so I hope that these comments are relative. I had hoped to finish the presentation before I went out of the country but since I leave

tomorrow for NYC for an overseas flight on Thursday. However, that will not happen so that what you see is a work in progress. I will show that using existing technology, barges, will reduce the number of transfers in shipping with a multi-modal system as presently planned. In addition, much greater loads can be carried so that fewer shipments will be required. Further, the heavy lifting equipment needed should be available at the sites. All sites at one time had barge facilities to bring in the pressure vessels and other large, heavy equipment. Many of these shipping facilities are not operational now but could be rehabilitated. I should think that would be less expensive than a couple of hundred of miles of new railroad track through difficult terrain. It also seems that the possibility of seismic events has not been studied.

Further, sub-seabed disposal, then interim storage and final shipment could be carried out from the nuclear naval shipyards would have all of the security and heavy lifting equipment required. We know that it is easier to site facilities where there already are nuclear facilities. Why all of the analyses have ignored such an obvious option is difficult for me to understand.

Finally, looking at slide 13, you can see that instead of investigating 9 final sites fully, they could easily have been reduced to 5. Looking at all of the sites in the East, caused enormous problems that could have been easily avoided.

I am back on the 15th of January and could have the full presentation available by the 23rd.

best personal wishes,

Frank

Happy New Year and a great report.